

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-30 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-5, 10-17, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mankovitz U.S. Patent No. 5,559,550 ("Mankovitz"). Claims 6-9 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, in view of Knee U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892 ("Knee"). Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankovitz, in view of Pugel U.S. Patent No. 5,748,261 ("Pugel").

Summary of the Applicants' Reply

Applicants have cancelled claims 2, 6, 8, 14, 18, 20, and 25-30 without prejudice. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 13, 15, 16, and 19 in order to more particularly define the invention. No new matter has been added, and the amendments of the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application (see, e.g., applicants' specification on page 12, lines 4-9 and page 15, lines 11-36);.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicants' Response to the
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Claims 1-5, 10-17, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mankovitz U.S. Patent No. 5,559,550 ("Mankovitz").

Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 13 are directed to a method and system for channel grazing

from an electronic program guide (EPG). In a first EPG mode, several selectable program listings, a last channel listing, and a picture-in-picture (PIP) window are displayed. The selectable program listings and the last channel listing are located in different areas of the EPG. In this first EPG mode, the program displayed in the PIP window corresponds to a selected first program among the several selectable program listings. In a second mode, several selectable program listings which includes the program listing for the selected first program, the last channel listing, and the PIP window are displayed. In response to a user selecting the last channel listing, the program being broadcast on the last channel is displayed in the PIP window. In response to the user selecting the program listing for the selected first program, the first program is displayed in the PIP window. In response to selecting a program listing, information related to the selected program listing is displayed, while the selected first program, which was selected in the first mode, is maintained in the PIP window.

Mankovitz refers to two on-screen electronic program guides (EPGs). In the first EPG, a user can highlight a program listing to cause the system to display the selected program of the listing in a PIP window (column 10, lines 56-60). In the second EPG, all the program listings for a selected channel are displayed from the currently broadcast program into the future (column 11, lines 19-47). Applicants respectfully submit that Mankovitz neither shows nor renders obvious the claimed invention.

Disclosure cannot be found in Mankovitz for a first or second EPG mode in which a plurality of selectable program listings and a last channel listing are displayed in separate areas as is required by applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 13. Further, disclosure cannot be found in Mankovitz for a second EPG mode in which:

in response to the selection of the last channel listing, displaying a program carried by the television channel in the picture-in-picture window; in response to the selection of the program listing for the first program, displaying the first program in the picture-in-picture window; and in response to the selection of one of the displayed second program listings, displaying information on the selected second program while maintaining the picture-in-picture window with the display of the first program

as is required by applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 13. Thus, Mankovitz does not show or render obvious all of the features of the applicants' claim 1 and 13.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Mankovitz. Claims 3-5, 7, 9-12, 15-17, 19, and 21-24, which depend from independent claims 1 and 13, are also allowable over Mankovitz for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Mankovitz. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 10-13, 15-17, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and the rejection of claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Chasan/

Michael J. Chasan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,026
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563